

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10                  AT TACOMA

11 HOLLY T.,

12                  Plaintiff,

13                  v.

14                  COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
15                  SECURITY,

16                  Defendant.

17                  CASE NO. 3:23-CV-5295-DWC

18                  ORDER REVERSING AND  
19                  REMANDING DEFENDANT'S  
20                  DECISION TO DENY BENEFITS

21                  Plaintiff filed this action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for judicial review of Defendant's  
22 denial of her application for disability insurance benefits ("DIB") and supplemental security  
23 income benefits ("SSI").<sup>1</sup> After considering the record, the Court concludes the Administrative  
24 Law Judge ("ALJ") erred when he failed to provide legally sufficient reasons for finding the  
opinion of Neal F. Moody, Jr., PA-C, unpersuasive. Had the ALJ properly considered this  
opinion, Plaintiff's residual functional capacity ("RFC") may have included additional

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34                  <sup>1</sup> Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 73, and Local Rule MJR 13, the parties  
have consented to have this matter heard by the undersigned Magistrate Judge. See Dkt. 3.

35                  ORDER REVERSING AND REMANDING  
36                  DEFENDANT'S DECISION TO DENY BENEFITS

1 limitations. The ALJ's error is, therefore, not harmless, and this matter is reversed and remanded  
 2 pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to the Commissioner of Social Security  
 3 ("Commissioner") for further proceedings consistent with this Order.

4 **I. Factual and Procedural History**

5 On January 25, 2021, Plaintiff protectively filed applications for DIB and SSI, alleging  
 6 disability beginning January 22, 2021. Dkt. 5, Administrative Record ("AR") 15, 296–309. After  
 7 her applications were denied at the initial level and on reconsideration, Plaintiff requested a  
 8 hearing before an ALJ. AR 15, 154–55, 186, 197, 224–26. Plaintiff was represented by counsel  
 9 at the hearing, which took place on February 22, 2022. AR 15, 81. The ALJ issued an  
 10 unfavorable decision on April 21, 2022. AR 12–28. The Appeals Council denied Plaintiff's  
 11 request for review. AR 1. Plaintiff then appealed to this court. Dkt. 1.

12 **II. Standard of Review**

13 When reviewing the Commissioner's final decision under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), this Court  
 14 may set aside the denial of social security benefits if the ALJ's findings are based on legal error  
 15 or are not supported by substantial evidence in the record. *Bayliss v. Barnhart*, 427 F.3d 1211,  
 16 1214 n.1 (9th Cir. 2005) (citing *Tidwell v. Apfel*, 161 F.3d 599, 601 (9th Cir. 1999)). Substantial  
 17 evidence "is a highly deferential standard of review." *Valentine v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec. Admin.*,  
 18 574 F.3d 685, 690 (9th Cir. 2009). Evidence is "substantial" when it is "more than a mere  
 19 scintilla." *Biestek v. Berryhill*, 139 S. Ct. 1148, 1153 (2019). "It means—and means only—'such  
 20 relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.'" *Id.*  
 21 (quoting *Consol. Edison Co. v. NLRB*, 305 U.S. 197, 229 (1938)).

22 "[T]he ALJ 'is responsible for determining credibility, resolving conflicts in medical  
 23 testimony, and for resolving ambiguities.'" *Ford v. Saul*, 950 F.3d 1141, 1149 (9th Cir. 2020)  
 24

1 (quoting *Andrews v. Shalala*, 53 F.3d 1035, 1039 (9th Cir. 1995)). Accordingly, “[e]ven if the  
 2 evidence is ‘susceptible to more than one rational interpretation, it is the ALJ’s conclusion that  
 3 must be upheld.’” *Farlow v. Kijakazi*, 53 F.4th 485, 488 (9th Cir. 2022) (quoting *Burch v.*  
 4 *Barnhart*, 400 F.3d 676, 679 (9th Cir. 2005)). However, ALJs must “set forth the reasoning  
 5 behind [their] decisions in a way that allows for meaningful review.” *Brown-Hunter v. Colvin*,  
 6 806 F.3d 487, 492 (9th Cir. 2015). “A clear statement of the agency’s reasoning is necessary  
 7 because [the Court] can affirm the agency’s decision to deny benefits only on the grounds  
 8 invoked by the agency.” *Id.*

9 “[H]armless error principles apply in the Social Security Act context.” *Molina v. Astrue*,  
 10 674 F.3d 1104, 1115 (9th Cir. 2012), *superseded on other grounds by* 20 C.F.R. § 404.1502(a).  
 11 Generally, an error is harmless if it is not prejudicial to the claimant and is “inconsequential to  
 12 the ultimate nondisability determination.” *Stout v. Comm’r, Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 454 F.3d 1050,  
 13 1055 (9th Cir. 2006); *see also Molina*, 674 F.3d at 1115.

14 **III. Discussion**

15 Plaintiff argues that the ALJ did not properly consider certain medical opinion evidence  
 16 and failed to support his findings with substantial evidence. *See* Dkt. 7.

17 **A. Medical Opinion Evidence Standard**

18 The regulations regarding the evaluation of medical opinion evidence have been amended  
 19 for claims filed on or after March 27, 2017. *See* Revisions to Rules Regarding the Evaluation of  
 20 Medical Evidence, 82 Fed. Reg. 5844, 5867–68, 5878–79 (Jan. 18, 2017). Because Plaintiff filed  
 21 her claim after that date, the new regulations apply. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520c, 416.920c.  
 22 Under the revised regulations, ALJs “will not defer or give any specific evidentiary weight,  
 23 including controlling weight, to any medical opinion(s) or prior administrative medical

1 finding(s). . . ." *Id.* §§ 404.1520c(a), 416.920c(a). Instead, ALJs must consider every medical  
2 opinion or prior administrative medical finding in the record and evaluate the persuasiveness of  
3 each one using specific factors. *Id.* §§ 404.1520c(a), 416.920c(a).

4 The two most important factors affecting an ALJ's determination of persuasiveness are  
5 the "supportability" and "consistency" of each opinion. *Id.* §§ 404.1520c(a), 416.920c(a).  
6 "Supportability means the extent to which a medical source supports the medical opinion by  
7 explaining the 'relevant . . . objective medical evidence.'" *Woods v. Kijakazi*, 32 F.4th 785, 791–  
8 92 (9th Cir. 2022) (quoting 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520c(c)(1)); *see also* 20 C.F.R. § 416.920c(c)(1).  
9 An opinion is more "supportable," and thus more persuasive, when the source provides more  
10 relevant "objective medical evidence and supporting explanations" for their opinion. 20 C.F.R.  
11 §§ 404.1520c(c)(1), 416.920c(c)(1). "Consistency means the extent to which a medical opinion  
12 is 'consistent . . . with the evidence from other medical sources and nonmedical sources in the  
13 claim.'" *Woods*, 32 F.4th 785 at 792 (quoting 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520c(c)(2)); *see also* 20 C.F.R. §  
14 416.920c(c)(2). ALJs must articulate "how [they] considered the supportability and consistency  
15 factors for a medical source's medical opinions" when making their decision. 20 C.F.R. §§  
16 404.1520c(b)(2), 416.920c(b)(2).

17       B. *Neal F. Moody, Jr., PA-C*

18 On July 26, 2021, rheumatology physician assistant Neal F. Moody, Jr., completed an  
19 "arthritis medical source statement" regarding Plaintiff. AR 1324. He indicated that he had seen  
20 Plaintiff every three months since August 24, 2015, most recently on May 3, 2021. *Id.* His list of  
21 Plaintiff's diagnoses included non-radiographic axial spondyloarthropathy and fibromyalgia,  
22 among others. *Id.* Mr. Moody wrote that Plaintiff complained of symptoms including fatigue,  
23 widespread muscle pain, throbbing pain of axial skeleton, stiffness, and pain of peripheral joints,  
24

1 which she had rated as nine out of ten at her most recent visit. *Id.* He checked boxes  
 2 corresponding to the following “positive objective signs:” reduced range of motion in Plaintiff’s  
 3 lumbar and cervical spine, myofascial trigger points, fibromyalgia tender points, impaired sleep,  
 4 tenderness, reduced grip strength, and abnormal gait. *Id.*

5 Based on these impairments, Mr. Moody indicated that Plaintiff would have various  
 6 functional limitations if placed in a competitive work situation. AR 1325–27. These restrictions  
 7 included significant limitations with reaching, handling, or fingering objects. AR 1326. Mr.  
 8 Moody estimated that, during an eight-hour working day, Plaintiff could only grasp, turn, or  
 9 twist objects fifteen percent of the time, perform fine manipulations twenty percent of the time,  
 10 and reach in front of her body or overhead ten percent of the time. AR 1327.

11 The ALJ found this opinion unconvincing. AR 25. He wrote that Mr. Moody’s statements  
 12 were “inconsistent with the record, unexplained, inadequately supported, brief, and conclusory.”  
 13 *Id.* The ALJ stated that the “check-box form” completed by Mr. Moody contained “insufficient  
 14 explanation for the severe limitations, such as manipulative limitations that are unexplained.” *Id.*  
 15 He also found that the limitations were inconsistent with Plaintiff’s “physical examinations  
 16 throughout the period at issue, which show intact upper and lower extremity strength, no focal  
 17 motor deficits, and normal gait,” as well as with Plaintiff’s recent work activity as a part-time  
 18 cashier and stocker. *Id.*

19 Plaintiff contends that the ALJ erred in his consideration of Mr. Moody’s opinion. Dkt. 7  
 20 at 2. Among other arguments, she points out that, although the ALJ found inadequate support for  
 21 the opined severe manipulative limitations, the ALJ appeared to adopt some limitations based on  
 22 Plaintiff’s spondylarthritis. *Id.* at 3. The ALJ’s decision contains an internal inconsistency on this  
 23 point. When summarizing Plaintiff’s musculoskeletal impairments, the ALJ stated that Plaintiff’s  
 24

1 “spondylarthritis is accommodated with limited handling and fingering[.]” AR 24. However, in  
2 the RFC, the ALJ wrote that Plaintiff “can perform frequent bilateral handling and fingering.”  
3 AR 21. The decision does not include any explanation of this discrepancy.

4 The Court reviews the ALJ’s decision in its entirety to determine whether the ALJ has  
5 adequately explained their conclusions. *See Kaufmann v. Kijakazi*, 32 F.4th 843, 851 (9th Cir.  
6 2022). Because the ALJ’s decision contains contradictory statements without explaining the  
7 basis for the contradiction, the Court cannot assess whether the ALJ properly evaluated Mr.  
8 Moody’s opinion on Plaintiff’s manipulative limitations. Accordingly, the ALJ erred. This error  
9 was not harmless because, had the ALJ been persuaded by Mr. Moody’s opined severe  
10 limitations, the RFC may have included additional limitations regarding Plaintiff’s capabilities in  
11 a work setting.

12 **IV. Conclusion**

13 Based on the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby finds the ALJ improperly concluded  
14 Plaintiff was not disabled. Accordingly, the Commissioner’s decision to deny benefits is reversed  
15 and this matter is remanded for further administrative proceedings in accordance with the  
16 findings contained herein.

17 Dated this 16th day of November, 2023.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24



25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 David W. Christel  
27 Chief United States Magistrate Judge  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34